DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 102 066 SO 008 105

AUTHOR Switzer, Thomas J.; And Others
TITLE Dissemination and Implementation of Social Studies Project Materials.
PUB DATE Nov 74
NOTE 38p.; A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (Chicago, Illinois, November 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Development; Curriculum Evaluation; *Information Dissemination; Projects; Secondary Education; Social Sciences; *Social Studies; State Surveys; Teacher Characteristics; *Use Studies

ABSTRACT

The extent to which secondary teachers in five midwestern states were cognizant of and were using curricular materials developed by 10 nationally recognized social studies curriculum projects is examined. The 10 curriculum projects include Amherst's Units in American History, Anthropology Curriculum Study Project, Berkeley's Asian Studies Inquiry Program, Carnegie-Mellon's Social Studies Curriculum Project, Harvard's Public Issues Series, The High School Geography Project, Indiana's American Political Behavior, Law in American Society Foundation's Justice in Urban America Series, San Jose State's Economics in Society, and Sociological Resources for the Social Studies. Objectives of the study were to find out the extent to which teachers have heard, examined, and received instruction in the use of project materials, and, further, to identify significantly related variables, sources through which teachers have heard about the materials, and the extent and use of materials in social studies courses. Data were obtained from a random selected sample of schools by means of a survey questionnaire. Findings show that only one of the projects has been heard of by more than 50 percent of the respondents; that respondents who teach a subject dealt with by a particular project are more likely to have heard and examined that project; that projects producing interdisciplinary materials have a high percentage of respondents having heard of the materials; and that even for the most widely used project only 20.2 percent of the respondents report using the materials. (Author/DE)

ED102066

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Dissemination and Implementation of Social Studies Project Materials

Thomas J. Switzer
Malcolm A. Lowther
William M. Hanna
Ralph D. Kidder

The University of Michigan

SO 008 105

A Research Report Prepared for Delivery at the 54th Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies

Chicago, Illinois

November 26-30, 1974

00002

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DISSEMINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF SOCIAL STUDIES PROJECT MATERIALS

Perhaps no field of education has changed more in recent years than has the social studies. In the last ten to fifteen years there have been considerable changes in attitude as to what should constitute social studies and important changes in teaching strategies designed to bring about desired outcomes.

Much, but not all, of the efforts to change the social studies have been channelled through curricular materials developed by national curriculum projects. Indeed, literally millions of public and private dollars have been spent on the assumption that the social studies could be changed by getting teachers to use new curricular materials in their classrooms.

Ever since the new project materials found their way into the market place, the debate has raged as to the extent of their use and if used, their effectiveness. However, little research exists on the extent of use of project materials or on the effectiveness of the materials. And what research does exist on the dissemination and use of project materials was conducted prior to the time when the project materials had been available to potential users for a reasonable period of time.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The study reported on here dealt with the extent to which secondary school social studies teachers in five midwestern states had heard of and were using curricular materials developed by ten nationally recognized social studies curriculum projects. Specifically the study sought to answer the following questions:

1. To what extent have secondary school social studies teachers heard of the project materials in social studies?
2. Through what sources have teachers heard of the project materials?
3. To what extent have secondary school social studies teachers examined the project materials?
4. To what extent have social studies teachers been instructed in the use of the project materials?
5. To what extent and in what courses are social studies teachers using project materials?
6. What variables are significantly related to social studies teachers hearing about, examining, and using project materials?

PROCEDURE

Using lists of the public high schools in the states of Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana and Wisconsin, the total number of secondary schools in the five states was determined. Each state's proportion of the total number of schools was then calculated and on the basis of this

proportion, a total of 100 schools was selected for the study: 13 in Indiana, 15 in Wisconsin, 22 in Michigan, 24 in Illinois, and 26 in Ohio. The schools within each of the subsamples were selected by means of a table of random numbers. Schools were selected as the sampling unit instead of teachers due to our inability to secure lists of social studies teachers for the states surveyed.

Data were obtained by means of a survey questionnaire developed by the researchers. The first section of the questionnaire contained 14 demographic items such as age, sex, undergraduate academic major, NCSS membership, courses taught, etc. In the second section of the questionnaire, participants were asked to respond to an identical set of questions for each of 10 nationally recognized curriculum projects in social studies: the Amherst Project, Anthropology Curriculum Study Project, Berkeley Asian Studies Program, Carnegie-Mellon Project, Harvard Public Issues Series, The High School Geography Project, Indiana's American Political Behavior Material, Law in American Society Foundation's Justice in Urban America Series, San Jose State--Economics in Society and Sociological Resources for the Social Studies. For each project there was a brief description of the project, a description of the materials developed, and a listing of the publisher. The description was followed by nine questions dealing with various aspects of knowledge about and use of project material.

Seven hundred questionnaires, each with an explanatory cover letter, were mailed to the principals of the 100 schools in the sample. Each principal also received a letter explaining the nature of the project and requesting cooperation in both distributing the questionnaire to social studies teachers and in completing a form specifying the actual number of questionnaires distributed. Three weeks after the initial mailing, a follow-up letter was sent to all of the principals and two weeks after that telephone calls were placed to the principals of those schools from which no response had been received.

Unfortunately, it is difficult to determine the actual response rate in this study. Two hundred sixty-three questionnaires were returned (252 were usable) for a response rate of 37.6 percent. However, few of the principals returned the forms specifying the number of questionnaires distributed to their teachers so we do not know the number of questionnaires which actually ended up in the hands of teachers. Further, the number of questionnaires sent to a particular school was based on an estimate of the number of social studies teachers necessary to staff a school with a particular size student population. And in every case, we sent one more questionnaire than we anticipated would be needed. For those schools where the principal did let us know the number of questionnaires distributed, we generally overestimated by at least one or two questionnaires. All of this leads us to believe that the actual

response rate was considerably higher than that based on the original number of questionnaires sent to school principals and that it was probably somewhat over 50 percent.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Before getting into a review of the data, it is interesting to note some of the characteristics of the respondents. Of the 252 respondents who could be coded, 33.1 percent came from Michigan, 21.5 percent from Ohio, 19.5 percent from Illinois, 13.5 percent from Indiana, and 12.4 percent from Wisconsin. Males made up 77 percent of the respondents. Over half (58.4 percent) of the respondents taught in small towns and rural settings. However, 56.3 percent taught in schools with a graduating class of 300 or more.

Respondents with ten or more years teaching experience made up 51.8 percent of the total, and 71.5 percent had taught four or more years in their present schools; 89.3 percent classified themselves as teachers with the remaining 10.7 percent identifying themselves as department heads; 53.2 percent wanted to continue as social studies teachers with 35.1 percent wanting to be upwardly mobile within education; 82 percent did not belong to The National Council for the Social Studies.

History majors made up 43.7 percent of the respondents with 34.5 percent listing a general social studies degree program. Very few had majored in the social science

disciplines. The majority of the respondents (58.2 percent) had an M.A. degree or higher.

FINDINGS

Table 1: Heard of Project Material by State and Total Respondents

When we examine Table 1 we see that only one of the projects had been heard of by more than 50 percent of the respondents--the Carnegie-Mellon Project with 57.8 percent having heard of it. Almost reaching the 50 percent heard level was the Law in American Society Project (49.6 percent) followed by the Harvard Project (44.1 percent), the Indiana Project (42.0 percent) and the Amherst Project (41.9 percent). It is also interesting to note that the three behavioral science projects funded by the National Science Foundation--Anthropology Curriculum Study Project, High School Geography Project, and Sociological Resources for the Social Studies--all came in at around the 30 percent heard level.

Among the various states there was considerable consistency with the possible exception of Ohio where the percentages hearing of the projects were somewhat lower than in the other states. It is also interesting to note that the most widely heard of projects--Carnegie, Law in American Society, Harvard, Indiana, and Amherst--do reasonably well in all the states.

Table 2: Heard of Project Materials by Subject Taught

Table 2 sheds some light on why certain projects are more heard of than others. First, we find what we would expect to find--that respondents who teach a subject matter dealt with by a particular project are more likely to have heard of that project than they are to have heard of a project which deals with a subject matter that they do not teach. Thus, we find 92.9 percent of those teaching anthropology had heard of the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project, 74.1 percent of those teaching geography had heard of the High School Geography Project, 69.7 percent of those teaching sociology had heard of Sociological Resources and so on.

But it is instructive to note that projects such as Carnegie-Mellon and Harvard, which produced materials in several discipline areas or materials which can be used equally well in several subject areas, have a high percentage having heard of the materials regardless of subject taught. Other projects such as the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project, the High School Geography Project, the Berkeley Project, San Jose, and Sociological Resources find that their popularity is somewhat limited to those respondents teaching the subject matter covered by the project. In some cases this may be a function of the title of the project or of teacher perception of what the project deals with and not a function of the actual nature of the materials. A case in point may be Sociological Resources, which produced a series of materials(episodes) for use in courses other

than sociology, including history courses. Yet only 25.9 percent of the U.S. history teachers and 24.2 percent of those teaching world history had even heard of the sociology materials.

Table 3: Examined Project Material by State and Total Respondents

At the had examined level (Table 3), we find the expected fall-off from the had heard of level. Forty-two and two-tenths percent of the respondents had examined the Carnegie-Mellon materials, a fall-off of 15.6 percent from the had heard percentage of 57.8 percent; 36.4 percent had examined Law in American Society materials, down 13.2 percent from the had heard percentage; and 35.2 percent had examined the Harvard materials, down 8.9 percent from the had heard percentage. All other percentages at the had examined level were below 30 percent with the bottom being anchored by the San Jose Project where only six percent of the respondents had examined the materials. The project suffering the greatest fall-off from the had heard to the had examined level was the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project which dropped 16.4 percentage points.

At the state level we see that the Carnegie, Harvard, and Law in American Society projects maintain their relatively high percentages across the five states surveyed.

Table 4: Examined Project Material by Subject Taught

When we look at the respondents who had examined the materials by subject taught (Table 4), we see the same

pattern as earlier--teachers are more inclined to examine project materials if the materials deal with the subject that they are teaching. Thus, 44 percent of the political science teachers had examined the Law in American Society series and 42.9 percent of them had examined the Indiana materials. A total of 78.6 percent of the anthropology teachers had examined Anthropology Curriculum Study Project materials and 63 percent of the geography teachers had looked at the High School Geography Project. But as was the case at the had heard level, only 11.9 percent of the U.S. history teachers had examined the SRSS materials in spite of the fact that some of these materials would be useful in U.S. history classes. A similar situation exists with other project materials.

Table 5: Use of Project Materials by State and Total Respondents

In Table 5 when we consider the actual use of project materials, we see that the Harvard materials were the most popular, with 20.2 percent of the respondents reporting using the materials. This is an interesting finding since at the had heard and the had examined levels, the Harvard project ranked no better than third behind the Carnegie-Mellon project and the Law in American Society project. At the use level the Carnegie project is ranked second (18.7 percent) with Law in American Society ranking third (17.6 percent). Only one other project produced a use factor of more than 10 percent, the Indiana project where 10.4 percent reported using the

materials. The figures are even more dramatic when looked at from the negative side of life; 94.4 percent were not using the Amherst materials, 94.4 percent were not using the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project materials, 98.9 percent were not using the Berkeley Asian Studies materials, 93.2 percent were not using the SRSS materials and so on.

Although there is some variation in use patterns by state, the patterns generally are similar to the pattern found when total respondents are considered.

Table 6: Use of Project Material by Subject Matter Taught

When we examine use of project material by subject taught (Table 6), we find a similar pattern to that reported at the other levels--the Carnegie and Harvard projects show a relatively high percentage of use across subject matter taught, while the other projects show a relatively high percentage of use only in the subject area where the project places its primary emphasis. Thus, 64.3 percent of the respondents teaching anthropology were using the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project materials, 33.3 percent of the geography teachers were using the High School Geography Project materials, and 36.4 percent of the sociology teachers were using the Sociological Resources materials. Surprisingly, only 7.4 percent of those teaching U.S. history were using the Amherst U.S. history units, but 22.2 percent were using Harvard materials and 20.7 percent were using Carnegie-Mellon materials. Unfortunately, at the use level, the

numbers we are dealing with become quite small.

Table 7: Use of Project Material as Percent of Total Respondents, as Percent of Had Heard, and as Percent of Had Examined.

Table 7 looks at use of project materials as a percent of total respondents on a particular project, as a percent of those who had heard of the project materials, and as a percent of those who had examined the materials. It is instructive to note that although only 20.2 percent of the total respondents were using Harvard Project materials, 45.9 percent of those who had heard of them were using the materials and 57.5 percent of those who had examined the materials were using them. Apparently the majority of those who examined the Harvard materials found them of some value in their classrooms.

Second in use among those who had examined the materials was the Law in American Society Project (48.4 percent) followed by the Carnegie-Mellon Project (44.3 percent). It is interesting to note the large jump made by the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project from use as a percent of those who had heard of the materials (18.9 percent) to use as a percent of those who had examined the materials (42.4 percent). One might conclude that those teachers who bothered to examine the anthropology materials found them attractive and usable in their classrooms. However, one might also conclude that only those teachers actually teaching anthropology bothered to examine the materials and that those teachers were the ones most likely to actually use the materials.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

On the low end of the scale, we see that only 4.5 percent of the respondents who had heard of the Berkeley materials were using them and that only 9.7 percent of those who had examined the materials were actually using them.

Table 8: Percent Receiving Instruction in the Use of Project Materials

Table 8 deals with those respondents who reported receiving instruction in the use of project materials. Instruction was not defined in the questionnaire so the nature of the instruction reported probably covers the range from college courses to institutes to one day workshops.

In only one case, the Carnegie-Mellon materials, did as many as 10 percent of the total respondents report receiving instruction in the use of the materials. However, when those who reported receiving instruction in the material is taken as a percentage of those who had heard of the material, we see considerable increase in the percentages with the Indiana Project taking the lead.

One might conclude from the data presented in this table that relatively more attention has been given to providing instruction in the Indiana Project, Sociological Resources, the High School Geography Project, the Carnegie-Mellon Project, and Anthropology Curriculum Study Project than has been given to providing instruction in the other project materials. In fact, it would appear that relatively

little attention has been given to providing instruction in the Harvard Project and in the Law in American Society Project in spite of their popularity and use.

Tables 9 and 10: Source of First Hearing

Tables 9 and 10 deal with the sources of first hearing about project materials. As we can see in Table 9, professional publications are the most frequent source of first hearing (25.2 percent) followed by friend or colleague (23.7 percent). It is interesting to note that the two most frequent sources of first hearing are a formal means (professional publication) and an informal means (friend or colleague).

The low percentage of respondents listing the publisher as a source of first hearing needs some explanation. Unfortunately, "publisher" was not one of the options listed on the questionnaire. However, enough respondents listed publisher in the questionnaire category for "other" that it deserved coding and special listing. If "publisher" had been an option on the questionnaire, one might assume that it would have been checked by more respondents.

Table 10 deals with source of first hearing by project and although there is some variation in where people first hear about a project, the data confirm that professional publications, friends or colleagues, and professional meetings tend to be important places of first hearing about the projects.

Tables 11--22: Heard by NCSS Membership

With Tables 11--22 we deal with one variable which

was found significantly related to having heard of project materials--NCSS membership. As you can see from Table 11, NCSS members were significantly more likely to have heard of project materials than were those respondents who were not NCSS members. This relationship held true for all of the projects with the exception of San Jose. Of course, it is not surprising that NCSS members were more likely to have heard of project materials than were non-NCSS members. Given the fact that professional publications are a major source of first hearing and given that Social Education has made a concerted effort to bring information about the projects to its readers, we would indeed be surprised if NCSS members had not heard of the project materials. In fact, we do have some evidence that NCSS members do use more formal means of hearing about new developments than do non-NCSS members. For six of the ten projects there was a significant positive relationship between NCSS membership and hearing about the project materials through professional publications. Three of the other projects produced data which lean in this direction with only the Amherst Project showing NCSS members and non-members just as likely to hear of the project through professional publications.

Further, four of the ten projects show a significant negative relationship between NCSS membership and hearing about the project through a friend or colleague--NCSS members were less likely to hear about the projects through a friend or colleague than were non-NCSS members. The other projects, although not showing a significant relationship on these

variables, produced data which lean in the direction of non-NCSS members using more informal means of communication than do NCSS members. Unfortunately, 82 percent of the respondents in this study were not NCSS members.

But if all of this is not surprising, what is surprising are the findings reported in Table 12--that NCSS members who had heard of project materials were no more likely to go on to examine the materials than were non-NCSS members who had heard of the materials. Apparently, those non-NCSS members who had heard of the project materials share some characteristic in common with NCSS members who had heard of the materials that leads them to the next step, an examination of the materials. And although not reported here, NCSS membership was also not a significant factor in the actual use of the project materials. This does not mean, of course, that NCSS membership has no bearing on the eventual use of project materials, for it obviously is an important factor in first hearing about the materials. But it should be remembered that NCSS membership in and of itself will not lead a person to examination and use of project materials.

Tables 11--22 are provided for your information so that you can see how NCSS membership was related to having heard of each of the curriculum projects included in this study.

DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

One aspect of this study that we are not reporting on today is the relationship of the remaining demographic

variables to knowledge of and use of the project materials. However, a quick scan of the data revealed only one variable which produced a pattern similar to that of NCSS membership--for nine of the ten projects, social studies department chairpersons were significantly more likely to have heard of the materials than were full-time social studies teachers. For the other variables there appear to be no patterns to indicate that any of these factors were significantly related to knowledge of and use of project materials. Some isolated significant relationships were found, but there were no patterns.

DISCUSSION

Now, what do we make of all this data? From one perspective, it is certainly discouraging to see that 70 percent of the respondents had never heard of SRSS, HSGP, and ACSP and that only the Carnegie project had been heard of by more than 50 percent of the respondents. And if one considers the millions of dollars spent on these project materials, it is certainly discouraging to see that for seven of the ten projects more than 90 percent of the respondents were not using the materials, and that for the most widely used project, the Harvard Project, that virtually 80 percent reported not using the materials. It is also discouraging to see that so few teachers had received instruction in the use of the project materials and especially so for those projects receiving relatively high use.

But from another perspective the data look less discouraging. Almost all the anthropology teachers had heard of the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project and 64 percent reported using the materials. Of the geography teachers, 74 percent had heard of HSGP and over 33 percent reported using the materials. Of the political science teachers, 24.2 percent were using American Political Behavior and almost 30 percent of them were using the Justice in Urban America series. And 36 percent of the sociology teachers were using SRSS materials. Given the abundance of materials available for classroom use, given the constant battle which project materials face with more traditional materials, and given the slowness of change in education, perhaps we should be pleased and not at all discouraged with the level of use of project materials. This is not to say, of course, that we can not improve our methods of communication or that we do not need to increase our efforts at in-service education. Indeed, a large potential market for the project materials is uninformed as to even the existence of the materials. But given the popularity of project materials within subject matter, and given that the materials have served as prototypes for future materials, perhaps all our time, money and effort have not been wasted. One would certainly hope not.

The tables presented here are from a study which sought to determine the dissemination and implementation of national curriculum project materials in social studies. The data are based on the responses of 252 high school social studies teachers in five midwestern states. The study was conducted during the spring of 1974 and was reported on at the 54th annual meeting of The National Council for the Social Studies, Chicago, Illinois, November 26-30, 1974. Further information on the study can be secured by writing to Thomas J. Switzer, 1022 SEB, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48104.

TABLE 1

HEARD OF PROJECT MATERIAL
BY STATE AND TOTAL RESPONDENTS

	STATE											
	Michigan		Ohio		Wisconsin		Illinois		Indiana		Total Respondents	
PROJECT	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Amherst	33	40.7	11	21.2	16	51.6	28	57.1	16	47.1	104	41.9
ACSP	33	40.2	7	13.0	8	25.8	16	33.3	10	30.3	74	29.7
Berkeley	17	20.5	14	26.4	9	31.0	18	36.7	8	24.2	66	26.6
Carnegie	45	54.9	27	50.0	21	67.7	30	61.2	21	61.8	145*	57.8
Harvard	39	47.6	19	35.8	18	60.0	21	43.8	12	36.4	109	44.1
HSGP	27	32.5	7	13.2	10	32.3	17	34.7	12	35.3	73	29.1
Indiana	34	41.5	23	43.4	9	29.0	19	38.8	20	58.8	105	42.0
Law in Am. Society	49	59.8	20	37.7	16	51.6	27	55.1	12	35.3	124	49.6
San Jose	6	7.2	2	3.7	7	22.6	12	24.5	4	11.8	31	12.3
SRSS	22	27.2	9	16.7	12	38.7	17	34.7	14	41.2	75*	30.0

*Total have heard respondents does not equal state totals combined due to state totals not including one respondent who could not be identified by state.

TABLE 2

HEARD OF PROJECT MATERIAL BY SUBJECT TAUGHT

PROJECT	SUBJECT TAUGHT																	
	U.S. Hist. N=135		Poli. Sci. N=91		Geog. N=27		Soc. N=33		Psych. N=28		Econ. N=36		World Hist. N=62		Anthro. N=14		Other N=77	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Amherst	63	46.7	42	46.2	9	33.3	14	42.4	8	28.6	22	61.1	20	32.3	7	50.0	32	41.6
ACSP	37	27.4	30	33.0	10	37.0	10	30.3	9	32.1	13	36.1	16	25.8	13	92.9	20	26.0
Berkeley	34	25.2	25	27.3	8	29.6	7	21.2	5	17.9	11	30.6	15	24.2	6	42.9	20	26.0
Carnegie	73	54.1	64	70.3	18	66.7	17	51.5	13	46.4	28	77.8	32	51.6	10	71.4	46	59.7
Harvard	61	45.2	41	45.1	14	52.0	15	45.5	10	35.7	17	47.2	27	43.5	9	64.3	32	41.6
HSGP	39	28.9	25	27.5	20	74.1	9	27.3	5	17.9	13	36.1	13	21.0	8	57.1	19	24.7
Indiana	55	40.7	53	58.2	11	40.7	13	39.4	12	42.9	19	52.8	22	35.5	9	64.3	30	39.0
Law in Am. Soc.	64	47.4	54	59.3	12	44.4	15	45.5	13	46.4	18	50.0	25	40.3	11	78.6	38	49.4
San Jose	17	12.6	14	15.4	5	18.5	4	12.1	3	10.7	16	44.4	5	8.1	3	21.4	10	13.0
SRJS	35	25.9	28	30.8	10	37.0	23	69.7	10	35.7	19	52.8	15	24.2	6	42.9	26	33.8

00033

TABLE 3

EXAMINED PROJECT MATERIAL
BY STATE AND TOTAL RESPONDENTS

	STATE											
	Michigan N=83		Ohio N=54		Wisconsin N=31		Illinois N=49		Indiana N=34		Total Respondents	
PROJECT	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%*
Amherst	20	24.1	4	7.4	11	35.5	17	34.7	12	35.3	64	25.8
ACSP	17	20.5	1	1.9	3	9.7	6	12.2	6	17.6	33	13.3
Berkeley	7	8.4	3	5.6	5	16.1	9	18.4	7	20.6	31	12.5
Carnegie	32	38.6	19	35.2	15	48.4	22	44.9	17	50.0	106**	42.2
Harvard	30	36.1	14	25.9	14	45.2	18	36.7	11	45.8	87	35.2
HSGP	17	20.5	4	7.4	6	19.4	11	22.4	8	23.5	46	18.3
Indiana	22	26.5	16	29.6	5	16.1	12	24.5	17	50.0	72	28.8
Law in Am. Society	36	43.4	10	18.5	14	45.2	21	42.9	10	29.4	91	36.4
San Jose	3	3.6	1	1.9	4	12.9	5	10.2	2	5.9	15	6.0
SRSS	8	9.6	5	9.3	7	22.6	11	22.4	13	38.2	44	17.6

*Percents are based on total number of respondents on each project.

**Total have examined respondents does not equal state totals combined since one respondent could not be classified by state.

TABLE 4

EXAMINED PROJECT MATERIAL BY SUBJECT TAUGHT

	SUBJECT TAUGHT																	
	U.S. Hist. N=135		Poli. Sci. N=91		Geog. N=27		Soc. N=33		Psych. N=28		Econ. N=36		World Hist. N=62		Anthro. N=14		Other N=77	
PROJECT	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Amherst	35	35.9	28	30.8	8	30.0	6	18.2	8	28.6	13	36.1	9	14.5	3	21.4	19	24.7
ASCP	16	11.9	12	13.2	6	22.2	4	12.1	4	14.3	4	11.1	7	11.3	11	78.6	11	14.3
Berkeley	16	11.9	10	11.0	4	14.8	4	12.1	1	3.6	6	16.7	9	14.5	5	35.7	10	13.0
Carnegie	59	43.7	41	45.1	13	48.1	13	39.4	9	32.1	8	22.2	24	38.7	8	57.1	36	46.8
Harvard	50	37.0	34	37.4	9	33.3	12	36.4	6	21.4	12	33.3	21	33.9	8	57.1	25	32.5
HSGP	23	17.0	15	16.5	17	63.0	5	15.2	3	10.7	7	19.4	6	9.7	5	35.7	12	15.6
Indiana	39	28.9	39	42.9	8	29.6	6	18.2	9	32.1	10	27.8	12	19.4	8	57.1	20	26.0
Law in Am. Soc.	48	35.6	40	44.0	9	33.3	10	30.3	10	35.7	13	36.1	14	22.6	11	78.6	30	39.0
San Jose	8	5.9	8	8.8	3	11.1	0	0	1	3.6	8	22.2	1	1.6	2	14.3	5	6.5
SRSS	16	11.9	14	15.4	8	29.6	18	54.5	7	25.0	7	19.4	8	12.9	3	21.4	17	22.1

SE000

TABLE 5

USE OF PROJECT MATERIAL
BY STATE AND TOTAL RESPONDENTS

	STATE											
	Michigan N=83		Ohio N=54		Wisconsin N=31		Illinois N=49		Indiana N=34		Total Respondents	
PROJECT	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%*
Amherst	5	6.0	1	1.9	2	6.5	3	6.1	3	8.8	14	5.6
ACSP	10	12.0	0	0	1	3.2	2	4.1	1	2.9	14	5.6
Berkeley	1	1.2	0	0	1	3.2	1	2.0	0	0	3	1.2
Carnegie	17	20.5	7	13.0	6	19.4	9	18.4	8	23.5	47	18.7
Harvard	18	21.7	7	13.0	8	25.8	10	20.4	7	20.6	50	20.2
HSGP	4	4.8	1	1.9	2	6.5	5	10.2	1	2.9	13	5.2
Indiana	12	14.5	3	5.6	1	3.2	4	8.2	6	17.6	26	10.4
Law in Am. Society	17	20.5	5	9.3	6	19.4	10	20.4	6	17.6	44	17.6
San Jose	0	0	0	0	2	6.5	2	4.1	0	0	4	1.6
SRSS	3	3.6	3	5.6	4	12.9	3	6.1	4	11.8	17	6.8

*Percents are based on total respondents on each project.

TABLE 6

USE OF PROJECT MATERIAL BY SUBJECT MATTER TAUGHT

	SUBJECT TAUGHT																	
	U.S. Hist. N=135		Poli. Sci. N=91		Geog. N=27		Soc. N=33		Psych. N=28		Econ. N=36		World Hist. N=62		Anthro. N=14		Other N=77	
PROJECT	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Amherst	10	7.4	3	3.3	2	7.4	2	6.1	2	7.1	3	8.3	3	4.8	0	0	4	5.2
ACSP	7	5.2	7	7.7	1	3.7	0	0	1	3.6	0	0	4	6.5	9	64.3	5	6.5
Berkeley	2	1.5	1	1.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.8	1	1.6	1	7.1	3	3.9
Carnegie	28	20.7	27	29.7	5	18.5	4	12.1	4	14.3	11	30.6	11	17.7	3	21.4	14	18.2
Harvard	30	22.2	24	26.4	7	25.9	8	24.2	4	14.3	8	22.2	14	22.6	6	42.8	17	22.1
HSGP	5	3.7	4	4.4	9	33.3	3	9.1	0	0	1	2.8	2	3.2	3	21.4	3	3.9
Indiana	10	7.4	22	24.2	2	7.4	1	3.0	2	7.1	3	8.3	3	4.8	4	28.6	9	11.7
Law in Am. Society	19	14.1	27	29.7	4	14.8	8	24.2	3	10.7	5	13.9	3	4.8	2	14.3	16	20.8
San Jose	2	1.5	2	2.2	1	3.7	0	0	1	3.6	4	11.1	0	0	0	0	1	1.3
SRSS	6	4.4	5	5.5	3	11.1	12	36.4	4	14.3	3	8.3	3	4.8	1	7.1	7	9.1

00027

TABLE 7

USE OF PROJECT MATERIAL

AS PERCENT OF TOTAL RESPONDENTS,

AS PERCENT OF HAD HEARD, AND

AS PERCENT OF HAD EXAMINED

PROJECT	AS PERCENT OF TOTAL	AS PERCENT OF HAD HEARD	AS PERCENT OF HAD EXAMINED
Amherst N=240	5.6	13.5	21.9
ACSP N=249	5.6	19.9	42.4
Berkeley N=248	1.2	4.5	9.7
Carnegie N=251	18.7	32.4	44.3
Harvard N=247	20.2	45.9	57.5
MSSP N=251	5.2	17.8	28.3
Indiana N=250	10.4	24.8	36.1
Law in Am. Society N=240	17.6	35.5	48.4
San Jose N=242	1.6	12.9	26.7
SPSS N=250	6.8	22.7	38.6

TABLE 8

PERCENT RECEIVING INSTRUCTION IN THE USE OF PROJECT MATERIAL

PROJECT	PERCENT OF TOTAL RESPONDENTS	PERCENT OF THOSE WHO HAD HEARD OF MATERIAL
Amherst	4	9.6
ACSP	4.8	16.2
Berkeley	.08	3.0
Carnegie	10.0	17.2
Harvard	5.3	11.9
MSGP	5.2	17.8
Indiana	8.8	21.0
Law in Am. Soc.	2.8	5.6
San Jose	1.6	12.9
SRSS	5.6	18.7

TABLE 9

SOURCE OF FIRST HEARING

OF PROJECT MATERIAL

SOURCE	N	%*
Professional Publication	229	25.2
Project Newsletter	82	9.1
College Course	106	11.7
Professional Meeting	159	17.5
Institute or Workshop	105	11.6
Friend or Colleague	215	23.7
Publisher	54	6.0
Other	73	8.1

*Percentages do not total to 100 due to respondents listing more than one source of first hearing about a project.

TABLE 10

SOURCE OF FIRST HEARING BY PROJECT

PROJECT	SOURCE															
	Prof. Publi-cation		Project News-letter		College Course		Prof. Meet-ing		Institute or Workshop		Friend or Colleague		Publisher		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Amherst	24	23.1	8	7.7	19	18.3	19	18.3	12	11.5	28	26.9	4	3.8	6	5.8
ACSP	17	23.0	8	10.8	5	6.8	13	17.6	7	9.5	16	21.6	7	9.5	8	10.8
Berkeley	25	37.9	4	6.1	8	12.1	11	16.7	5	7.6	8	12.1	3	4.5	3	4.5
Carnegie	37	23.4	7	4.8	27	18.6	25	17.2	24	16.6	31	21.4	5	3.4	15	10.3
Harvard	28	25.7	12	11.0	15	13.8	18	16.5	11	10.1	25	22.9	6	5.5	9	8.3
HSGP	15	20.5	11	15.1	12	16.4	17	23.3	9	12.3	21	28.8	4	5.5	2	2.7
Indiana	22	21.0	10	9.5	8	7.6	22	21.0	17	16.2	24	22.9	6	5.7	8	7.6
Law in Am. Soc.	29	23.4	10	8.1	4	3.2	16	12.9	9	7.3	37	29.8	14	11.3	13	10.5
San Jose	11	35.5	3	9.8	2	6.5	4	12.9	4	12.9	6	19.4	0	0	3	9.7
SRSS	20	26.7	9	12.0	6	8.0	14	18.7	7	9.3	19	25.3	5	6.7	6	8.0

00034

TABLE 11

HEARD OF PROJECT MATERIAL
AS RELATED TO MEMBERSHIP IN THE
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE
SOCIAL STUDIES

PROJECT	X^2	df	P *	C
Amherst	14.0	1	<.0003	.23
ACSP	13.3	1	<.0004	.23
Berkeley	14.3	1	<.0003	.23
Carnegie	10.7	1	<.002	.20
Harvard	5.4	1	<.03	.15
HSGP	8.4	1	<.004	.18
Indiana	9.7	1	<.002	.19
Law in Am. Soc.	8.9	1	<.005	.18
San Jose	.50	1	NS	.04
SRSS	16.8	1	<.0001	.25

*With the exception of the San Jose Project, all of the relationships are positive -- respondents who were members of NCSS were significantly more likely to have heard of the various national projects than were those respondents who were not NCSS Members.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 12

EXAMINED PROJECT MATERIAL
AS RELATED TO MEMBERSHIP IN
THE NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE
SOCIAL STUDIES

PROJECT	X^2	df	P*	C
Amherst	.43	1	< .52	.06
ACSP	.16	1	< .70	.05
Berkeley	.33	1	< .86	.02
Carnegie	2.12	1	< .15	.12
Harvard	.49	1	< .49	.07
HSGP	.12	1	< .92	.01
Indiana	.41	1	< .53	.06
Law in Am. Soc.	2.12	1	< .15	.13
San Jose	1.92	1	< .17	.24
SRSS	.67	1	< .80	.03

*The significance levels reported in this table do not reach the 0.05 level of confidence which was required throughout the study to denote significance. The data are presented to show that NCSS members who had heard of project materials were no more likely to examine the materials than were non-NCSS members who had heard of the materials.

TABLE 13

HEARD OF AMHERST MATERIALS
BY NCSS MEMBERSHIP

NCSS MEMBERSHIP

	YES	NO	
Had Heard	67.4% 29	36.5% 74	103
Had Not Heard	32.6% 14	63.5% 129	143
	43	203	246

$X^2 = 14.0$, df = 1, $P<.003$, C = .23

TABLE 14

HEARD OF ACSP MATERIALS
BY NCSS MEMBERSHIP

NCSS MEMBERSHIP

	YES	NO	
Had Heard	52.3% 23	24.6% 50	73
Had Not Heard	47.7% 21	75.4% 153	174
	44	203	247

$X^2 = 13.3$, df = 1, $P<.004$, C = .23

TABLE 15

HEARD OF BERKELEY MATERIALS
BY NCSS MEMBERSHIP

NCSS MEMBERSHIP

	YES	NO	
Had Heard	48.9% 22	21.4% 43	65
Had Not Heard	51.1% 23	78.6% 158	181
	45	201	246

$X^2 = 14.3$, df = 1, $P<.0003$, $C = .24$

TABLE 16

HEARD OF CARNEGIE MATERIALS
BY NCSS MEMBERSHIP

NCSS MEMBERSHIP

	YES	NO	
Had Heard	80.0% 36	53.4% 109	145
Had Not Heard	20.0% 9	46.6% 95	104
	45	204	249

$X^2 = 10.7$, df = 1, $P<.002$, $C = .20$

TABLE 17

HEARD OF HARVARD MATERIALS
BY NCSS MEMBERSHIP

NCSS MEMBERSHIP

	YES	NO	
Had Heard	60.0% 27	41.0% 82	109
Had Not Heard	40.0% 18	59.0% 118	136
	45	200	245

$X^2 = 5.4$, df = 1, $P<.03$, C = .15

TABLE 18

HEARD OF HSGP MATERIALS
BY NCSS MEMBERSHIP

NCSS MEMBERSHIP

	YES	NO	
Had Heard	46.7% 21	25.0% 51	72
Had Not Heard	53.3% 24	75.0% 153	177
	45	204	249

$X^2 = 8.4$, df = 1, $P<.004$, C = .18

TABLE 19

HEARD OF INDIANA MATERIALS
BY NCSS MEMBERSHIP

NCSS MEMBERSHIP

	YES	NO	
Had Heard	62.2% 28	36.9% 75	103
Had Not Heard	37.8% 17	63.1% 128	145
	45	203	248

$X^2 = 9.7$, df = 1, $P<.002$, C = .19

TABLE 20

HEARD OF LAW IN AMERICAN SOCIETY
MATERIALS BY NCSS MEMBERSHIP

NCSS MEMBERSHIP

	YES	NO	
Had Heard	68.9% 31	45.3% 92	123
Had Not Heard	31.1% 14	54.7% 111	125
	45	203	248

$X^2 = 8.2$, df = 1, $P<.005$, C = .18

TABLE 21

HEARD OF SAN JOSE
MATERIALS BY NCSS MEMBERSHIP

NCSS MEMBERSHIP

	YES	NO	
Had Heard	15.6% 7	11.7% 24	31
Had Not Heard	84.4% 38	88.3% 181	219
	45	205	250

$X^2 = .50$, df = 1, P = NS, C = .05

TABLE 22

HEARD OF SRSS MATERIAL
BY NCSS MEMBERSHIP

NCSS MEMBERSHIP

	YES	NO	
Had Heard	55.6% 25	24.5% 50	75
Had Not Heard	44.4% 20	75.5% 154	174
	45	204	249

$X^2 = 16.9$, df = 1, P<.0001, C = .25